



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/054,230	11/13/2001	Zheng Fang	D2795	3735
27774	7590	12/12/2005	EXAMINER	
MAYER, FORTKORT & WILLIAMS, PC			BLOUNT, STEVEN	
251 NORTH AVENUE WEST			ART UNIT	
2ND FLOOR			PAPER NUMBER	
WESTFIELD, NJ 07090			2668	

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/054,230	Applicant(s) FANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Steven Blount	Art Unit 2668	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                         |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                                       | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                              | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 – 16, and 20 - 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent application 20040252683 to Kennedy et al in view of either U.S. patent 5,845,267 to Ronen, or U.S. patent 6,938,171 to Isomichi et al.

With regard to claim 1, Kennedy teaches creating a cross-connection between two endpoints, said endpoints comprising public IP addresses (par 32 line 4; par 53, in its entirety). Kennedy does not however teach providing a cross-connection ID to the two endpoints.

Ronen teaches the fundamental concept of providing a connection ID for this information. See col 4 lines 40+. Isomichi teaches this in col 4 lines 25+.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided a cross-connection ID to Kennedy in light of the teachings of either one of Ronen or Isomichi et al in order to simplify the connection establishment process.

With regard to claims 2 – 4, see par 7 and 33 of Kennedy.

With regard to claim 5, note the server in Kennedy.

With regard to claims 6 – 11, see par 32 of Kennedy.

Art Unit: 2668

With regard to claim 12, see the rejection of claim 1, and note that it would have been an obvious variation well within the ordinary skill in the art to apply the teachings of connecting 2 endpoints in the manner described in Kennedy to 3 endpoints, as cited in this claim.

With regard to claims 13 – 16, see the rejections above.

With regard to claims 20 – 23, see the rejection of claims 1 and 12 above, and note that, with regard to claim 23, a session manager is taught in Ronen, member 116.

3. Claims 17 – 19 and 24 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. patent application 20040252683 to Kennedy et al in view of either U.S. patent 5,845,267 to Ronen, or U.S. patent 6,938,171 to Isomichi et al as applied above, and further in view of U.S. patent 6,671,262 to Kung et al.

Kennedy/Ronen or Isomichi et al teach the invention as described above, but do not teach mixing the packets. This is taught in Kung et al. See col 11 lines 45+.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have mixed the packets of Kennedy/Ronen or Isomichi et al, in light of the teachings of Kung et al, in order that a conference call may be set up.

4. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. patent 6,671,262 to Kung et al in view of U.S. patent 5,845,267 to Ronen.

Kung teaches mixing endpoint information as discussed above, but does not explicitly teach using a cross connection ID. This is taught in Ronen as discussed above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

Art Unit: 2668

invention to have used a cross connection ID in Kung in light of the teachings of Ronen in order that a connection may be more effectively created.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Blount whose telephone number is 571 - 272 - 3071. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Chau Nguyen, can be reached on 571 - 272 - 3126. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Ajit Patel  
Primary Examiner

SB  
  
11/28/05